

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16, 18-20 and 22-27 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2 and 7 are amended and claims 25-27 are added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims and the drawings. Withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over He in view of Bonnaure. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for accessing the Internet using an Internet TV, including transmitting a message from the Internet TV to the server requesting authentication for use of information during a current session, transmitting a message from the server requesting an authentication number from the Internet TV, and transmitting the requested authentication number from the Internet TV to the server if the authentication number is available, checking a validity of the transmitted authentication number, and providing information to the Internet TV for the current session if it is determined that the authentication number is valid. The method also includes requesting a new authentication number from the server if the authentication number is not available, registering a user in accordance with information collected by the server, receiving a new authentication number from the server, and providing information to the Internet TV for use during the current session, and storing the new authentication number in a memory device of the Internet TV for use during a later session. The new authentication number is a combination of at least one of a model name, a

manufacturing year or a manufacturing month of the Internet TV. Independent claims 2 and 7 recite similar features in varying scope. He neither discloses nor suggests the features of independent claim 1, 2 and 7, or the respective claimed combinations of features.

He discloses a security system that controls access to individual network elements 102. A user registers with a registration database 210 (S404), an authentication server 202 validates the user (S406), and a credential server 204 checks precision of the user's credentials (S408). The validated and credentialed user is screened against element access lists to determine which of the network elements 102 the user is allowed to access (S410), and information flows between the network element 102 and the user (S412) as security auditing is performed (S414). To perform an initial login, the user enters an ID and password (S602), the ID and password are authenticated (S604), and an access list is constructed for the particular user (S608). A general ticket is issued to allow access to the network elements 102 in the access list (S610, S612).

To access a specific network element 102, the element 102 is selected (S702, S704), and a session ticket and a session encryption key is issued to allow access to the selected element 102 during that session (S706, S708). Once the data exchange is complete and the user has logged out, the general ticket, the session ticket, and the session encryption key are destroyed, and the process must be repeated for later access.

He neither discloses nor suggests that any of the issued tickets (compared in the Office Action to the claimed authentication number) are stored in a memory device for use during a

later session, as recited in independent claims 1 and 7. Further, He neither discloses nor suggests that any one of the general ticket, the session ticket or the session encryption key is generated by combining at least one of a model name, a manufacturing year, or a manufacturing month of the Internet TV, as recited in independent claims 1, 2 and 7.

Further, Bonnaure is merely cited in the Office Action as allegedly teaching an Internet TV in Figure 5, and thus fails to overcome the deficiencies of He. Further, as set forth in previous replies, the system shown in Figure 5 of Bonnaure shows an ISDN modem connected to a standard TV that uses standard telephone lines and/or other residential communication networks as a transport medium. The TV shown in Bonnaure's figures is simply being used as a monitor, and is not, by itself, an Internet TV in which a function of accessing the Internet and a function of receiving a TV broadcast are combined, as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 2 and 7 are allowable over the applied combination, and thus the rejection of independent claims 1, 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over He and Bonnaure should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 4, 5, 9, 10 and 21 are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1, 2 and 7, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 7-10, 14, 20 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bonnaure. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The features of independent claims 1, 2 and 7 are set forth above. As also set forth above, Bonnaure neither discloses nor suggests the features of independent claims 1, 2 and 7, or

the respective claimed combinations of features. Further, it would not have been obvious to modify the television disclosed by Bonnaure to include the use of an authentication number that is generated by combining at least one of a model name, a manufacturing year, or a manufacturing month of such an Internet TV, as recited in independent claims 1, 2 and 7. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 2 and 7 are allowable over Bonnaure, and thus the rejection of independent claims 1, 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bonnaure should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 3, 4, 8-10, 14, 20 and 22-24 are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1, 2 and 7, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejects claims 5, 6, 11-13, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bonnaure in view of Dorfman. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 5, 6, 11-13, 18 and 19 are allowable over Bonnaure at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1, 2 and 7, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features. Further, Dorfman is merely cited as allegedly teaching examination of encryption keys for validity, and thus fails to overcome the deficiencies of Bonnaure. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5, 6, 11-13, 18 and 19 are allowable over the applied combination, and thus the rejection of claims 5, 6, 11-13, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bonnaure and Dorfman.

The Office Action rejects claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bonnaure in view of Nobakht. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 15 is allowable over Bonnaure at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 7, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Further, Nobakht is merely cited as allegedly teaching determination of payment of a user fee, and thus fails to overcome the deficiencies of Bonnaure. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is allowable over the applied combination, and thus the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bonnaure and Nobakht should be withdrawn.

New claims 25-27 are added to the application. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 25-27 meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1, 2 and 7, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Joanna K. Mason**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. **09/996,718**

Docket No. **P-0303**

Amdt. dated May 20, 2008

Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2008

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y. J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Joanna K. Mason
Registration No. 56,408

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777

Date: May 20, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610